arXiv:0911.2504v1 [quant-ph] 12 Nov 2009

Relativity, signal locality and the uncertainty principle (or How Bohr could have replied to Einstein if he knew about Bell)

Eric G. Cavalcanti

Centre for Quantum Dynamics, Griffith University, Brisbane QLD 4111, Australia

Abstract

In the early stages of the famous debates between Einstein and Bohr on the foundations of quantum mechanics, Einstein attempted to devise thought experiments aiming at showing that arbitrarily accurate predictions of incompatible physical quantities was possible, in violation of Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. Bohr was able to defend quantum mechanics from those attacks by showing that a careful application of the uncertainty principle to the experimental apparata as well as the measured system lead to consistent results. Could Bohr have given an *independent* argument for the irreducible unpredictability implied by the uncertainty principle? The celebrated 1964 theorem of John Bell [2] shows that no model that reproduces the predictions of quantum mechanics can simultaneously satisfy the ontological concepts of locality and determinism. However, nothing can be concluded from Bell's theorem alone about locality by itself or determinism by itself — it is possible to reproduce quantum-mechanical predictions with deterministic models which violate locality as well as indeterministic models which satisfy locality. On the other hand, there's almost universal agreement that the epistemic form of locality — signal locality, or the impossibility of faster-than-light communication — must hold in a relativistic universe. By making a similar distinction between determinism and the epistemic concept of predictability, I show that signal locality plus the bare observed phenomena of Bell inequality violations lead to the remarkable conclusion that Nature is fundamentally unpredictable. This result grounds the quantum-mechanical prohibition of arbitrarily accurate predictions on the principle of relativity, regardless of any postulates of quantum mechanics.

1 Introduction

Since its inception, quantum mechanics has been riddled with controversies and paradoxes. Einstein and Bohr were the protagonists of one of the most interesting debates in the history of science in attempting to make sense of the theory. The implications of their intellectual confrontation are still seen today. Here I will revisit the early stages of the debate, before the Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen paper [6] and the extremely fruitful concept of entanglement that was born from it. The debate surrounded the uncertainty principle derived by Heisenberg in 1927 [9]. Einstein attempted to concoct thought experiments that intended to show that one could obtain knowledge of incompatible observables beyond that allowed by the uncertainty principle, thus showing that quantum mechanics was *incorrect*. Bohr could always show, by an analysis of the experimental setup proposed by Einstein, that carefully applying the uncertainty principle to the experimental apparatuses would lead to an invalidation of Einstein's argument, thus showing that the uncertainty principle was *consistent*, even if not correct. Interestingly, in the last of such attempts from Einstein, Bohr used Einstein's own theory of general relativity to demonstrate the consistency of quantum mechanics. Here I will show that the principle or relativistic invariance (in particular the concept of signal locality that is a consequence of it) in fact implies much more than that. Taken in conjunction with some bare experimental observations (namely the violation of Bell inequalities) we can conclude that Nature is fundamentally unpredictable — in accordance with the uncertainty principle — irrespective of any of the postulates of quantum mechanics.

This work also builds on and clarifies some more recent results. In the 1994 paper where they brought to light the existence of stronger-than-quantum correlations compatible with signal locality, Popescu and Rohrlich [10] have commented on an unpublished result of Aharonov to the effect that "relativistic causality" and "nonlocality" imply "indeterminism". The physical basis of the result I will show in this paper seems to be the same, but I believe my discussion will be useful to clarify a very important distinction and a source of much misunderstanding in discussions on quantum foundations — that between *determinism* and *predictability*. Strictly speaking, the result that Popescu and Rohrlich pointed out is incorrect: the conjunction of *signal locality* (which is a consequence of relativistic causality) and *Bell-nonlocality* (which is, I believe, the type of nonlocality they had in mind in that passage) implies the failure of predictability, and not of determinism. This should be clear by the fact that there exists a theory that reproduces quantum mechanics (and therefore satisfies signal locality and displays Bell-nonlocality) but is nevertheless deterministic, namely Bohmian mechanics.

The main result in this paper also relates to the mechanism underlying the security of quantum key distribution based on signal locality and Bell inequality violations, recently proved by Barrett, Hardy and Kent [1]. In the discussion of their result, they cited a paper of Valentini [13] that purported to show that "any state that is deterministic and nonlocal allows signalling". Since what they meant by "determinism" was the same as I here mean by "predictability", this is essentially the contrapositive of my result. However, this was strictly speaking not proved in Valentini's paper. He claimed to have proved that for all nonlocal deterministic hidden-variable theories, a violation of signal locality occurs if and only if the theory allows a distribution of hidden variables different from that which is needed to reproduce quantum mechanics, i.e., if and only if the distribution is different from that of "quantum equilibrium"[1]. In any case, although the main result in this paper stems from a simple and previously noticed result, I believe that the current presentation of it will serve to clarify some important foundational issues and provide an interesting new perspective.

2 The Einstein-Bohr debates

> "The Solvay Conference in Brussels in the autumn of 1927 closed this marvellous period in the history of atomic theory. Planck, Einstein, Lorentz, Bohr, de

---

[1] Besides, Valentini's main result seems to be flawed. He seems to have only proved the weaker result that under those conditions there exist distributions over the hidden variables which would allow signalling, as the reader may be convinced by analysing the first equation on page 276 of that paper.

> Broglie, Born, and Schrödinger, and from the younger generation Kramers, Pauli and Dirac, were gathered here and the discussions were soon focussed to a duel between Einstein and Bohr..." — Heinsenberg (1967), reproduced in [14], pg. 7.

The duel Heisenberg mentions in the quote above was one of the early stages of the famous debates between Einstein and Bohr on the foundations of quantum mechanics. Earlier in the year of 1927, Heisenberg ([9], English translation in [14]) had published his paper on the *uncertainty principle* required by the quantum formalism for measurements of conjugate observables, which for position and momentum observables is given by the inequality

$$\Delta q \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2}. \tag{1}$$

In September of the same year, Bohr had presented his concept of *complementarity* in the International Physical Congress in the city of Como ([4], reproduced in [5]). Einstein was not present in Como, but the two giants met in October for the Fifth Physical Conference of the Solvay Institute, in Brussels. Bohr recounted:

> "At the Solvay meetings, Einstein had from their beginning been a most prominent figure, and several of us came to the conference with great anticipations to learn of his reaction to the latest stage of the development which, to our view, went far in clarifying the problems which he had himself from the outset elicited so ingeniously. During the discussions (...) Einstein expressed, however, a deep concern over the extent to which causal account in space and time was abandoned in quantum mechanics." — [4], reproduced in [5], pg. 20.

Einstein proposed, starting in that Solvay conference, a series of thought experiments aiming to criticise the interpretation of quantum theory defended by Bohr and his colleagues. Heisenberg recollected that

> "We generally met at breakfast in the hotel, and Einstein began to describe an ideal experiment in which he thought the inner contradictions of the Copenhagen interpretation were particularly clearly visible." [14], pg. 7.

Einstein's first thought experiment, as recounted by Bohr, was the classic double-slit experiment[2]. A single particle passes through a diaphragm with a narrow slit, and the outgoing wave diffracted by the slit hits another diaphragm with two slits. After passing through the double-slit diaphragm the particle hits a photographic plate a certain distance away. An interference pattern is formed in the screen, revealing the wave-like nature of the particle. Under these circumstances, the interpretation of quantum mechanics being developed by Bohr and Heisenberg maintained that the question of which slit the particle went through was meaningless — it could only be made meaningful if a detection of the position of the particle was actually performed.

Although the final goal of Einstein in these early criticisms seems to be similar to the goal of his 1935 paper with Podolsky and Rosen — i.e., to argue for the incompleteness of quantum mechanics — these initial exchanges were marked by an attempt by Einstein to prove a much stronger result: that the uncertainty principle derived by Heisenberg was simply empirically wrong. That is, Einstein aimed to show that one could, by ingenious means, obtain knowledge of two complementary observables beyond that allowed by the newly developed quantum mechanics. In this particular thought experiment, Einstein proposed that by looking at the momentum transferred to the first diaphragm, one could determine the direction taken by the particle after passing through it, thus determining which slit the particle went through in the second diaphragm, in apparent contradiction with Heisenberg's uncertainty principle. It didn't take long for Bohr to point out the mistake in Einstein's reasoning. Heisenberg recalls that "Bohr had usually finished the complete analysis of the ideal experiment late in the afternoon and showed it to Einstein at the supper table." [14]

---

[2] It is not clear in Bohr's account, however, whether the double-slit setup was originated by Einstein or was developed in the course of the discussion which seems to have started with the case of single slit diffraction.

In this particular experiment, after sketching Einstein's proposed apparata in a pseudo-realistic style to emphasise the role and physical construction of the measuring devices, Bohr analysed that

> "A closer examination showed, however, that the suggested control of the momentum transfer would involve a latitude in the knowledge of the position of the diaphragm which would exclude the appearance of the interference phenomena in question. In fact, if ω is the small angle between the conjectured paths of a particle passing through the upper or the lower slit, the difference of momentum transfer in these two cases will, according to [the equation $p = h\sigma$ connecting the momentum p of a particle and its wave vector σ], be equal to $h\sigma\omega$ and any control of the momentum of the diaphragm with an accuracy sufficient to measure this difference will, due to the indeterminacy relation, involve a minimum latitude of the position of the diaphragm, comparable with $1/\sigma\omega$. If (...) the diaphragm with the two slits is placed in the middle between the first diaphragm and the photographic plate, it will be seen that the number of fringes per unit length will be just equal to $\sigma\omega$ and, since an uncertainty in the position of the first diaphragm of the amount of $1/\sigma\omega$ will cause an equal uncertainty in the positions of the fringes, it follows that no interference effect can appear." — [4], reproduced in [5], pg. 20.

That is, Bohr replied that Einstein was right about being able to determine which slit the particle went through by arranging to measure the momentum transferred to the first diaphragm, but that this arrangement would change the nature of the phenomenon observed, such that the interference effect would no longer be observed. According to Heisenberg, however, "Einstein had no good objections to this analysis, but in his heart he was not convinced." [14] The dispute would continue.

In the next Solvay conference, in 1930, Einstein and Bohr would meet again, and their discussion would, in Bohr's words, take "quite a dramatic turn" by Einstein's introduction of relativity in his newly designed thought experiments. Einstein argued that a simple measurement of mass should allow one to measure the total energy of a system through Einstein's famous energy-mass relation,

$$E = mc^2. \tag{2}$$

Einstein proposed a device that would use this fact in an attempt to violate the energy-time uncertainty principle: "A box with a hole in its side, which could be opened or closed by a shutter moved by means of a clock-work within the box. If, in the beginning, the box contained a certain amount of radiation and the clock was set to open the shutter for a very short interval at a chosen time, it could be achieved that a single photon was released through the hole at a moment known with as great accuracy as desired. Moreover, it would apparently also be possible, by weighing the whole box before and after this event, to measure the energy of the photon with any accuracy wanted, in definite contradiction to the reciprocal indeterminacy of time and energy quantities in quantum mechanics." [4]

Ironically, Bohr used Einstein's own theory of *general* relativity to counter this attack. To that end, Bohr used in his analysis of the thought experiment the general relativistic prediction that the rate of the clock used to determine the time of escape of the photon would be affected by its position relative to a gravitational field, according to the principle of equivalence. Again with a pseudo-realistic sketch of the device, Bohr imagined that the weighing of the box was accomplished by means of suspending it with a coil and using a pointer to determine the height of the box while using variable weight loads to adjust the height to its initial position after the release of the photon. Bohr noted that by the uncertainty principle (1), any determination of this height with an accuracy Δq would be accompanied by an uncertainty in the vertical momentum of $\Delta p \geq \hbar/2\Delta q$. This uncertainty must be smaller than the total impulse that can be given to the box by a gravitational field g by adding a weight load of mass Δm during an interval T, $\Delta p < Tg\Delta m$. Now, by general relativity a displacement Δq of the box in the direction of the gravitational field will lead to a change in the clock's rate of $\Delta T/T = g\Delta q/c^2$. By putting these together and using Einstein's equation (2) we thus obtain that $c^2\Delta m\Delta T = \Delta E\Delta T \geq \hbar/2$, in agreement with the energy-time uncertainty principle. Bohr once again defeated Einstein's criticism.

Note, however, that Bohr's defences only demonstrated that Einstein's experiments were not able to violate the uncertainty principle. And even if we consider that he could have given an argument that would be valid for all similar types of thought experiments, at most he would have demonstrated the *consistency* of the uncertainty principle. That is, it showed that *if* the uncertainty principle is valid for the degrees of freedom of all measuring apparatuses themselves *then* those measuring apparatuses can't be used to violate the uncertainty principle associated to a quantum system. Could Bohr have gone beyond that, and argued, with appeal to independent fundamental principles, that the uncertainty principle must be valid? In the remainder of this paper I will show that the principle of relativity and some experimental observations in entangled quantum systems (namely, the violation of Bell inequalities) lead to a version of an uncertainty principle, quite independently of any of the postulates of quantum mechanics. This result puts on a solid ground the fundamental epistemic prohibition of arbitrarily accurate measurements of all physical properties of a system by an use of Einstein's own theory of relativity.

3 Experimental metaphysics

Abner Shimony (the 'S' in 'CHSH') coined the term "experimental metaphysics" to refer to the field of study initiated by Bell, where general metaphysical[3] concepts like local causality are shown to lead to experimental constraints which can be tested in the laboratory. In the following I will introduce the concepts of experimental metaphysics required to prove my main result.

---

[3] For the physicist trained to be suspicious of philosophical terms, please note that the term 'metaphysics' does not refer to mystical concepts, but to formal and conceptual properties of sets of physical theories. It is a study of sets of possible physical theories, including theories which *fail* to represent our physical observations, where this analysis can be illuminating in understanding those that *do*. Thus the prefix 'meta'. Far from attempting to introduce vaguely defined concepts in physics, this field attempts to be as precise as possible in

The experimental setup considered here will involve two spatially separated observers, Alice and Bob, who can perform a number of measurements and observe their outcomes. For each pair of systems they perform measurements upon, the choices of measurement settings and their respective outcomes occur in regions which are space-like separated from each other, so that no signal travelling at a speed less than or equal to that of light could connect any two of them. For each pair of systems, we will denote by a and b Alice's and Bob's respective measurement settings, and by A and B their corresponding observed outcomes. Each pair of systems is prepared by an agreed-upon reproducible procedure c. The events corresponding to this preparation procedure are necessarily in the intersection of the past light cones of the measurements yielding A and B. The symbol λ will represent any further variables (in addition to a, b and c) that may be relevant to the outcomes of the measurements considered, that is, conditioned upon which the probabilities of the experimental outcomes may be further specified. They are not fully determined by the preparation procedure c, and as such may be deemed "hidden variables". They are necessarily not known in advance, since any known additional variables could be assimilated into the preparation c. Conversely, if some of the variables associated with the preparation procedure are unknown, they must be assimilated into λ. In other words, the distinction between c and λ is merely epistemic, i.e., c represents the set of *known* relevant variables and λ represents the set of *unknown* (but not necessarily *unknowable*) relevant variables. When an equation involving variables appears, it is to be understood that the equality holds for all values of those variables.

We will define a **phenomenon**, for a given preparation procedure c, by the relative frequencies

$$f(A, B|a, b, c). \tag{3}$$

for all measurements a, b, and corresponding outcomes A, B. Note that this definition does not imply a philosophical position regarding the interpretation of probabilities as frequencies (as opposed to degrees of belief). The definition simply acknowledges that in any physical experiment, the actual data observed are just those relative frequencies (with some associated statistical uncertainty that can in principle be made arbitrarily small). The probabilities to be found within the specification of models, however, can be given an interpretation in terms of subjective degrees of belief if one so wishes.

In general, models can make use of unobserved or even unobservable variables. Nevertheless, those variables can be interpreted as having an existence independent of observers, i.e., they can be taken to have ontological status. Thus one can refer to such models as ontological models[12, 11, 8, 7]. An ontological model for the phenomena under consideration is one in which the observed phenomena can be explained as arising out of our ignorance of underlying variables, where our ignorance is accounted for with standard probability theory. An **ontological model** (or **model** in short) for a phenomenon consists of the set Λ of values of λ, together with a probability distribution $P(\lambda|c)$ for every preparation procedure c and a specification of

$$P(A, B|a, b, c, \lambda) \tag{4}$$

---

the definition of concepts which are increasingly used by physicists anyway in referring to their theories, and to extract logical and experimental consequences of those concepts.

which reproduces the phenomenon by

$$\sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda} P(\lambda|c)\, P(A,B|a,b,c,\lambda) = f(A,B|a,b,c). \tag{5}$$

Nothing in the following discussions hangs on whether the λ are discrete or continuous, so for simplicity I use discrete hidden variables. The above definition can be extended to a continuous set of hidden variables in the standard way. Note that in Eq. (5) I have used the assumption of **external conditionalisation**, by which the choices of experiment a, b, can be conditioned on free variables uncorrelated with λ, such that knowledge of those choices does not provide any further information about the hidden variables, i.e., it does not change their probability distribution. This is often called the *free will* assumption, but that terminology seems to imply something about human capabilities that doesn't seem to be necessary for the purposes at hand, and so I prefer to avoid that term so as not to cause unnecessary confusion. Formally, this is the assumption that

$$P(\lambda|a,b,c) = P(\lambda|c). \tag{6}$$

A pair of concepts which will be important in this paper are the concepts of *signal locality* and that of *locality* or *parameter independence.* A model is said to satisfy **locality** if and only if

$$P(A|a,b,c,\lambda) = P(A|a,c,\lambda), \tag{7}$$

plus the corresponding equation for B. A model is said to satisfy **signal locality** if and only if

$$P(A|a,b,c) = P(A|a,c), \tag{8}$$

plus the corresponding equation for B. Locality is an *ontological* concept (about how the model represents the world to *be*), while signal locality is an *epistemological* concept (about what the model allows one to *know*). Note that a model satisfies signal locality if and only if the corresponding phenomenon also does. The violation of Eq. (8) implies the possibility to transmit signals between the experimental sites, as intended by the definition. If the phenomenon violates signal locality, then there exist at least two possible choices of setting b, b' such that $f(A|a,b,c) \neq f(A|a,b',c)$. Therefore by looking at the frequency of outcomes of A in a large enough ensemble (and in principle it is always possible for Alice to make all of the measurements in her ensemble space-like separated from all measurements in Bob's ensemble), Alice can determine with arbitrary accuracy what setting Bob has chosen. Conditioning this choice on a source of information, Bob can thereby send signals to Alice.Violation of *locality*, on the other hand, does not imply signalling, since in general only the probabilities for Alice's outcomes conditioned on the hidden variables depend on the choice of experiments at Bob's site. But since those hidden variables can be unknowable *in principle*, that kind of non-locality cannot necessarily be used to transmit signals. Bohmian mechanics is an example of a model that violates locality but not signal locality.

We now come to the crucial distinction between the concepts of *determinism* and *predictability.* A model is said to be **deterministic**, or to satisfy **determinism**[4], if and only if

$$P(A,B|a,b,c,\lambda) \in \{0,1\}, \tag{9}$$

---

[4] There is another useful sense of determinism which needs to be distinguished from the one I am using

which implies that A and B are functions of

$$A = A(a, b, c, \lambda),\ B = B(a, b, c, \lambda). \tag{10}$$

On the other hand, a model is said to be **predictable**, or to satisfy **predictability** if and only if

$$P(A, B|a, b, c, \lambda) = P(A, B|a, b, c) \in \{0, 1\}. \tag{11}$$

This implies that A and B are functions of

$$A = A(a, b, c),\ B = B(a, b, c). \tag{12}$$

This definition is motivated by the fact that the variables represented by c are known. Determinism is an *ontological* concept (about how the model represents the world to *be*), while predictability is and *epistemological* concept (about what the model allows one to *know*). It is interesting to note that it is impossible to prove determinism to be false by itself, since very phenomenon can be given a deterministic model, simply by postulating a sufficient number of (perhaps unkowable) hidden variables.

Obviously, predictability implies determinism, but the converse is not true. Heisenberg's uncertainty principle implies that no model that reproduces quantum mechanics is predictable, but it imposes no limitation on determinism. In fact, there are models of quantum mechanics (Bohmian mechanics is an example) which are deterministic, but where the hidden variables are in principle unknowable. Therefore what Einstein was trying to show in 1927 was not that quantum mechanics could be made deterministic, but that it could be made predictable.

4 Bell, relativity and signal locality

John Bell's famous 1964 theorem[2] demonstrated that the conjunction of the concepts of *locality* and *determinism* as defined above leads to a set of experimental constraints known as *Bell inequalities*[5], and that some predictions of quantum mechanics regarding entangled states violate those inequalities. I won't give the full derivation of a Bell-type inequality here. For our purposes I just need to point out that to derive a Bell-type inequality it is sufficient to show that the joint probabilities of experimental outcomes given by a model is **factorisable**, i.e., that it can be written in the form

$$P(A, B|a, b, c, \lambda) = P(A|a, c, \lambda)P(B|b, c, \lambda). \tag{13}$$

To see that locality and determinism imply factorisability, note that the joint probabilities can in general be written as$P(A, B|a, b, c, \lambda) = P(A|B, a, b, c, \lambda)P(B|a, b, c, \lambda)$. If the model

---

here. Quantum mechanics can be said to be deterministic in the sense that for a closed system the state at a later time is determined through an unitary evolution by the state at an initial time. However, operational quantum mechanics (which denies the existence of hidden variables) is not deterministic in the sense used in this paper.

[5] Bell inequalities can also be derived from a stronger concept that Bell termed *local causality*. This was used by Bell to argue that it was not possible to have a locally causal but indeterministic model that reproduces quantum mechanics (even if his original theorem did not rule out a indeterministic but local model). That is, he argued that the type of indeterminism that could be able to reproduce quantum mechanics has a nonlocal character that was made clearer by the concept of local causality. I won't pursue that distinction here, as it won't be important for our main result and thus could cause confusion in some readers.

is deterministic, then $P(A|B,a,b,c,\lambda) = P(A|a,b,c,\lambda)$, because A is already determined by a,b,c,λ and thus that probability cannot changed by conditioning on B. From the definition of locality given by Eq. (7) we thus arrive at the factorisable model of Eq. (13).

Bell took his theorem to imply that nonlocality was an unavoidable feature of any model of quantum mechanics, and thus that the main objection made against his favoured Bohmian mechanics (that it was nonlocal) was unfounded. Bell was adamant in stressing that his concept of locality was quite distinct from the concept of signal locality. In fact, he rejected the importance of the concept of signal locality, as he understood that it was hard to talk about it without using anthropocentric terms like 'information' and 'controllability':

> "Suppose we are finally obliged to accept the existence of these correlations at long range [...]. Can *we* then signal faster than light? To answer this we need at least a schematic theory of what *we* can do, a fragment of a theory of human beings. Suppose we can control variables like a and b above, but not those like A and B. I do not quite know what 'like' means here, but suppose the beables somehow fall into two classes, 'controllables' and 'uncontrollables'. The latter are no use for *sending* signals, but can be used for *reception*." — [3], pg.60.

But he rejects the idea that signal locality could be taken as the fundamental limitation imposed by relativity:

> "Do we have to fall back on 'no signalling faster than light' as the expression of the fundamental causal structure of contemporary theoretical physics? That is hard for me to accept. For one thing we have lost the idea that correlations can be explained, or at least this idea awaits reformulation. More importantly, the 'no signalling...' notion rests on concepts which are desperately vague, or vaguely applicable. The assertion that 'we cannot signal faster than light' immediately provokes the question:
>
> > Who do we think *we* are?
>
> *We* who can make 'measurements', *we* who can manipulate 'external fields', *we* who can signal at all, even if not faster than light? Do *we* include chemists, or only physicists, plants, or only animals, pocket calculators, or only mainframe computers?" —[3], pg.245.

I believe Bell is right in that we cannot define signal locality without referring to epistemological concepts. We do need to know which variables are knowable or not, and which variables are controllable or not. I would however disagree that there needs to be anything anthropocentric in those definitions. I see no fundamental difficulty in talking about machines "knowing" and "controlling" the variables defined in the previous section. Physicists primed in modern quantum information theory (which wasn't the case with Bell) would tend to have less objections to employing those concepts. Since locality (and local causality) imply signal locality, then even if Bell was right and signal locality is not the fundamental concept required of relativity (but one of those stronger concepts), it is certainly a rather uncontroversial consequence of it, once the conceptual qualms pointed out by Bell are sorted, and thus its implications should be pursued. In fact, signal locality has attracted much attention in the quantum information literature recently, since Popescu and Rohrlich [10] showed that there are "stronger-than-quantum" correlations compatible with signal locality.

The implication of signal locality that I will point out in this paper is that taken together with the concept of predictability, it implies factorisability. Thus signal locality and predictability allow one to derive Bell-type inequalities. The proof is simple. We first note that we can always write $P(A,B|a,b,c) = P(A|B,a,b,c)P(B|a,b,c)$. By the definition of predictability, the outcomes at each side are both functions of a,b,c. Therefore the probability for outcome A is independent of the outcome B once those three variables are specified. Thus, $P(A,B|a,b,c) = P(A|a,b,c)P(B|a,b,c)$. Assuming signal locality, i.e. Eq. (8), we obtain

$$P(A,B|a,b,c) = P(A|a,c)P(B|b,c).$$

This has the factorisable form of (13), as required. To make that more explicit, we could rewrite it with a trivial $\lambda = \lambda_0$ such that $P(\lambda_0|c) = 1$. Therefore, signal locality plus predictability imply Bell inequalities.

5 Conclusion

Since experiments routinely violate Bell inequalities (up to some open loopholes), we can conclude, through the theorem proved in the last section, that signal locality and predictability cannot both the true. Now this allows an interesting conclusion. Bell showed in 1964 that locality and determinism cannot both be true. Some people have taken that to imply indeterminism, choosing to keep locality. Bell later showed, however, that the stronger concept of local causality also implies Bell inequalities and must thus be false. Therefore even if one chooses rejects determinism, the resulting indeterminism still has a nonlocal character by Bell's argument. The result is thus that nothing can be concluded separately about the ontological concepts of determinism and locality from the violation of Bell inequalities.

However, the validity of signal locality has a much less controversial footing. Even those who believe in the violation of ontological locality would generally agree that signal locality must be valid, and that while a violation of ontological locality can have a "peaceful coexistence" with relativity, a violation of signal locality would be a momentous blow on our assumptions about physical theory. Therefore the full weight of the violation of Bell inequalities can be confidently transferred to the violation of the concept of predictability. There can be no predictable model that allows violation of a Bell inequality. To the extent that those violations actually occur in Nature, we can conclude that the world is indeed not predictable.

Furthermore, we arrive at this conclusion without needing to assume anything about quantum mechanics. It is simply a consequence of bare experimental data and an uncontroversial consequence of the theory of relativity. Bohr, of course, could not have known about this result before Bell, but if he did, he could have much more easily convinced Einstein that his attempts to make quantum phenomena predictable were bound to fail. An interesting question for further research is whether the assumption of signal locality together with the observed violations of Bell inequalities (plus perhaps some plausible additional assumption) can be used to derive further constraints on predictability so as to reproduce exactly Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.

I am indebted to Howard Wiseman for innumerous discussions about the issues surrounding Bell's theorem. His notes on the topic strongly influenced not only the style of the presentation of this paper but my own understanding of the topic. I am also grateful to Rob Spekkens for useful feedback and encouragement. This work was partly supported by an Australian Research Council postdoctoral research fellowship.

References

[1] J. Barrett, L. Hardy, and A. Kent. No signaling and quantum key distribution. *Physical Review Letters*, 95(1):010503, 2005.

[2] J. S. Bell. On the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox. *Physics*, 1:195, 1964.

[3] J. S. Bell. *Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

[4] Niels Bohr. Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics. In P. A. Schilpp, editor, *Albert Einstein: Philosopher-Scientist*, pages 200–41. The Library of Living Philosophers, Evanston, 1949.

[5] Niels Bohr. Discussion with Einstein on epistemological problems in atomic physics. In J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek, editors, *Quantum Theory and Measurement*, chapter I.1. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983.

[6] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen. Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete? *Physical Review*, 47:777, 1935.

[7] Nicholas Harrigan and Terry Rudolph. Ontological models and the interpretation of contextuality. *arXiv:0709.4266*, 2007.

[8] Nicholas Harrigan and Terry Rudolph. Representing probabilistic data via ontological models. *arXiv:0709.1149*, 2007.

[9] W. Heinsenberg. Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik. *Zeitschrift für Physik*, 43:172–98, 1927.

[10] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich. Quantum nonlocality as an axiom. *Foundations of Physics*, 24(3):379–385, 1994.

[11] Terry Rudolph. Ontological models for quantum mechanics and the Kochen-Specker theorem. *arxiv:quant-ph/0608120*, 2006.

[12] R.W. Spekkens. Contextuality for preparations, transformations, and unsharp measurements. *Physical Review A*, 71(5):052108, 2005.

[13] Antony Valentini. Signal-locality in hidden-variables theories. *Physics Letters A*, 297:273–278, 2002.

[14] J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek, editors. *Quantum Theory and Measurement.* Princeton University Press, 1983.